## Exhibit B

And just for purposes of the record, I should have started out by saying and noting -- and it should be obvious now -- that this matter is being conducted via Zoom and not in person. And again, for what it's worth, the Court looks forward to not having to go through this exercise and getting you all back here in person so that we can see your faces and have you announce your appearances live and in person.

So I think we all know that the first matter for the Court to address today is the ruling on the estimation motion, I suppose at long last, and this matter was previously heard by the Court on, was first heard by the Court on September 19, 2019 and at that time I continued the hearing until October 23, 2019 to issue my ruling and, as you know, rather than give you a decision about the estimation motion at that continued hearing I ordered the case to mediation and, for what it's worth, I think that was the right decision. A lot was said at the original hearing on estimation that steered me in that direction, largely comments about wanting to reach a consensual resolution and suggesting that the parties had their numbers and knew what it would take to resolve the case.

For those reasons and others, I ordered the case to mediation. I think none of us can disagree about the fact that reaching a consensual resolution in a case like this is preferable, if not necessary, for many reasons, not the least of which is reducing costs and eliminating time-consuming